DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 709 TM 017 578

TITLE National Curriculum Task Group on Assessment and Testing: Three Supplementary Reports.

INSTITUTION Department of Education and Science, London (England).; Welsh Office, London (England). Education Dept.

PUB DATE Mar 88

NOTE 67p.; For the main report, see ED 330 697.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; Educational Assessment; Educational Attainment; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; National Programs; *Program Implementation; School Districts; *Standardized Tests; *Systems Development; Testing Programs; Test Use

IDENTIFIERS *British National Curriculum; Task Force Approach; *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Three supplements to the main report (December 1987) of the Task Group on Assessment and Testing in the United Kingdom are presented. The first report, "Reactions to the Main Report," examines the chief issues raised in public reaction to the main report. The national reaction has been largely positive and supportive. It is reaffirmed that to meet national curriculum objectives a balance is required between standardized tests and other forms of assessment, and that use of both externally prescribed and teacher-made tests offers the best means of securing standards, enhancing skills, and improving learning. The second report, "Application of the Framework to Individual Students," records the outcome of discussions with some subject specialists on the application of the proposed assessment framework to individual subjects. Specific advice is given with regard to attainment targets, performance levels, and aggregation of results. The third report, "A System of Support," presents conclusions about the implementation, administration, and support of the system needed for the national assessment framework. The general criteria that the organizational structure should meet and the functions of each body in the system are discussed. An appendix to the third report contains the case study illustrating program implementation in a large county school district. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JOHN BIRCH
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED338709

National Curriculum

Task Group on Assessment and Testing

Three Supplementary Reports

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Department of Education and Science
and Welsh Office

TM 017 578

National Curriculum

Task Group on Assessment and Testing

Three Supplementary Reports

Department of Education and Science
and Welsh Office

King's College London (KQC)

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

CHELSEA CAMPUS
552 KING'S ROAD, LONDON SW10 0UA TELEPHONE: 01-351 2488

CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT
Professor P. J. Black, OBE, KSG

25 March 1988

Rt Hon Kenneth Baker MP
Secretary of State for Education and Science
Department of Education and Science
Elizabeth House
York Road
London SE1 7PH

Dear Secretary of State

TASK GROUP ON ASSESSMENT AND TESTING

When I submitted our first and main repo·t at the end of December, you agreed that we should undertake supplementary work. This has now been completed and I present herewith three supplementary reports.

We have studied responses to our main report. The group members have learnt a great deal from the large number of talks that they have been invited to give. We have been encouraged by the very positive reactions, both from those within the profession and from wider audiences. In particular we have found that audiences of parents and parent-governors have welcomed the proposals. The letters and published commentaries have borne out these personal impressions.

However it has also become clear that we need to explain more fully the implications of some of our recommendations. Our first supplementary report deals with issues of this type.

The second supplementary report deals with the application of our recommendations to the various foundation subjects for which they should provide the assessment framework. Our conclusions here are based on written and oral evidence presented by groups and by individual experts.

Our third supplementary report takes further the preliminary discussions presented in paragraphs 200 to 218 in our main report. It presents arguments and recommendations about the System of Support that will be needed.

These reports complete our work. I am happy to assure you that they have the support of all members of our Group. Many members of your Department have continued to give invaluable help to our work and the group wishes to record its appreciation and thanks to them.

Yours sincerely

Professor P.J. Black
Chairman
Task Group on Assessment and Testing

TASK GROUP ON ASSESSMENT AND TESTING

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT: REACTIONS TO THE MAIN REPORT

SUMMARY

The first supplementary report examines the chief issues raised in public reaction to the Task Group's main report submitted at Christmas 1987, and comments on these. The reaction has been largely positive and supportive. None of the criticisms voiced has been sufficient to cause the Group to revise its recommendations significantly. But the reactions have indicated that some of the conclusions need further explanation or emphasis. The aspects thus covered in this supplementary report include:

- attainment targets and teachers' assessments
- group moderation
- aggregation of data
- GCSE links
- reporting and publication
- records of achievement
- security and confidence in results
- evaluation and review
- implications for teaching and learning
- essential features of the system

The Group reaffirms that to meet national curriculum objectives a balance is required between standardised tests (both written and otherwise) and other forms of assessment; and that the use of externally-prescribed tests and of teachers' own assessments, combined through effective moderation procedures, offers the best means of securing standards, enhancing professional skills and improving learning. It concludes that no alternative or simplified system could guarantee these or achieve the general criteria stipulated in its main report and remit.

March 1988

TASK GROUP ON ASSESSMENT AND TESTING

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT:
REACTIONS TO THE MAIN REPORT

Introduction

1. In his response to the Task Group's main report submitted to him at Christmas 1987, the Secretary of State accepted our suggestion that, as part of our further work, discussions with subject working groups and our own consideration of comments on the main report might lead us to suggest further elaborations on or amendments to our original recommendations. This first supplementary report addresses the chief issues raised in the public reaction to our main report, and offers further comments on our proposals.

2. The reaction has in large measure been positive and supportive. There have also been criticisms. None of these has however developed arguments sufficient to lead us to revise our recommendations in any significant way. But the reactions have indicated that some of our conclusions need further explanation or emphasis. These are discussed below, in broadly the order presented in our main report: attainment targets and teachers' assessments; group moderation; aggregation of data; GCSE links; reporting and publication; records of achievement; security and confidence in results; evaluation and review; implications for teaching and learning; tackling cross-curricular needs; and what are the essential features of the system.

Attainment targets and teachers' assessments

3. There has been some misunderstanding about the assessment of "ability", to which our main report may inadvertently have contributed by occasionally using that term. We had intended to confine our proposals to the assessment of "performance" or "attainment" and were not recommending any attempt to assess separately the problematic notion of underlying "ability". If

"ability" were to be assessed, its meaning would have to be carefully defined; and the problem of defining it without making it merely the measure of a particular type of performance is hard to solve.

4. There has been some confusion about the construction of our system of ten levels of performance: in particular its practicability, and how it relates to attainments at particular ages. We recognise that defining the single set of levels will involve subject working groups in substantial effort, but the task is feasible. We should stress that this single system across the age range means that many of the early assumptions about age-related attainment targets no longer apply in those terms. Initially, the norms now expected for particular ages will be used in helping to identify criteria appropriate for the system of ten levels; but once devised, the system will rest on the levels and criteria alone, through which different pupils may progress at different paces. Programmes of study will then give general guidance about work appropriate to the attainment of targets at each level. It must be stressed that 7, 11, 14 and 16 are simply ages at which the level that each pupil has reached is determined and reported - they are <u>reporting</u> ages only. The way in which reported attainment of pupils collectively relates to age will be established as a matter of fact, and can be expected to change over time.

5. Another issue raised was the relationship between the number of attainment targets in each subject and their degree of generality or specificity. On one hand, a small number of targets, each couched in fairly general terms, gives maximum room for flexibility in teaching and learning but lacks clarity and precision for assessment purposes. On the other hand, many and highly specific targets may increase clarity and precision but leave little room for flexibility and may indeed become unmanageably complex. On balance, just as we saw dangers in specifying too many profile components, so we also conclude that the numbers of attainment targets should be kept small, and that they should not be too specific and detailed. Subject working

groups will need to consider how many, how specific and what kind of targets are appropriate, having regard to the nature and span of knowledge, skills and understanding in their subject and their assessability, bearing in mind the above arguments.

6. Whilst profile components are clusters of attainment targets, it is possible that where some profile components are analytic and others synthetic in the same subject, the same attainment targets may feature in both (eg first in knowledge, and then in use of that knowledge). We also envisage that a target may be defined as a single criterion (eg can use a clinical thermometer) or as a linked strand - or sequence - of criteria (eg measurement of temperature). The former applies at only one level, while the latter can be applied through detailed criteria at several levels. Either usage is legitimate but the two should not be confused. We think that the second usage - regarding an attainment target as a strand of related criteria defined at several levels - will be the more useful in securing economy and clarity for communication purposes.

Group moderation

7. Several critical commentaries on our proposed system of group moderation have appeared, but they seem to be based on a misunderstanding of paragraphs 74-77 and Appendix H of our main report.

8. Part of the difficulty may lie in grasping what statistical moderation involves and what action then follows. It may be helpful to illustrate this with a hypothetical example. A school in a moderating group meeting for age 7 assessment will have three sets of distributions to consider:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
(a) Percentage distribution of year group in individual school, by internal assessment	5% (7%)	80% (80%)	15% (13%)

(figures for all schools in moderating group in brackets)			
(b) Percentage distribution of year group in individual school, by national assessment tasks (all moderating group schools in brackets)	15% (12%)	80% (80%)	5% (8%)
(c) National percentage distribution for year group from overall assessment in previous year	10%	80%	10%

The group's task is to establish confidence in the assessment standards being applied by reconciling the group distributions in (a) and (b) with the national evidence in (c), and then by reconciling each individual school's distributions with those established for the group in (a) and (b). Samples of some pupils' work from different schools would be compared in order to check consistency of grading standards. Discrepancies between the national patterns and those for the group and for individual schools would have to be justified by reference to demonstrable consistency in grading standards and by other explanations for the differences. Failing that, the distributions for one or more schools would be adjusted to bring them into line with the pattern agreed by the moderation meeting to be appropriate for the schools in question. Each such school would then revise its results for individual pupils where necessary to fit the agreed distribution pattern. The outcome would be reflected in the overall assessments reported for each pupil.

9. Some particular practical points have been raised. First, some have suggested that those running meetings for moderation may at the outset need samples of assessed tasks to serve as external standards. We envisage that trials can provide these, once the trial items have been developed to a satisfactory level. Secondly, several commentators have stressed that teachers'

application of national assessment tests and tasks cannot produce results that are reliable across schools without careful training and trials, using techniques well-known for 16+ examinations. We have assumed this to be the case and have taken the requirement into account in our discussion elsewhere of INSET needs.

10. A further practical point is that because teachers' own assessments have an important part to play, attention must be given to developing the methods and skills that teachers will need to make these assessments. The externally-prescribed national assessment tests and tasks will not be adequate to assess pupils' achievement of all of the attainment targets. It is only through teachers' appraisal, over an extended period, of pupils' progress in the curriculum, which is defined by these targets, that comprehensive evidence can be created. Whilst teachers must have freedom in choosing how to implement the curriculum, some uniformity will be needed in the way that they produce evidence of attainment through their internal assessments. This is important because teachers' internal assessments can only be given the weight that they deserve in the moderation process if teachers can produce and exchange substantial evidence of the basis for their assessments. We deal elsewhere with the implication of this argument for INSET needs: it can be noted here that training in assessment has to be integrated with training in the implementation of the curriculum that the attainment targets define.

11. Fears have been expressed that our proposals ultimately entail jettisoning, and thus devaluing, either the teachers' internal assessments or the national assessment task results in the event of discrepancy. Some oppose the first course, others the second. We wish to emphasise that both forms of assessment are important and have distinctive contributions to make: neither should reign supreme. But authority should rest with the moderating group, based on discussion and agreement following examination of hard evidence of samples of pupil performance, to resolve any discrepancies by whatever means seems most appropriate in the light of the evidence. We have already

proposed that persistent discrepancies not explained by other evidence of pupil performance or by variations in teachers' marking standards should be reported to those responsible for the design and monitoring of the national assessment instruments which may then need to be reviewed. Local results will in any case feed into national data collation and analysis, and so influence the overall picture, which in turn will inform future work locally. We believe these checks and balances will strengthen collective professional skills as well as protecting the integrity of national assessment standards.

Aggregation of data

12. There has been some comment about the undesirable loss of useful information when aggregating performance data as we propose. For most recording and reporting purposes, however, it is essential that the quantity of information be limited so that it is both manageable and intelligible. We believe our scheme offers a reasonable compromise between helpful detail and comprehensibility. It is important to distinguish the different kinds and levels of aggregation involved.

- First, there is aggregation across attainment targets in assessing the overall level in a profile component for an individual pupil. To allow flexibility we suggest that rules for this may differ from one subject component to another, and should be devised by the working groups, having regard to the nature of their subject.

- Secondly, aggregation across profile components in a subject to give an individual pupil a single level or score for reporting to parents etc: this we do not generally recommend for reasons given in our main report (paragraphs 184-186: see also our second supplementary report).

- Next, there is aggregation across groups of pupils to produce an overall class or school profile. Information about individuals is lost here, but the subject profile is retained. Aggregation gives the distributions of the pupils in a year group across the levels, and it is these distributions which should be reported (see paragraphs 84, 184, 185 and 186 of our main report).

- Fourthly, aggregation can be undertaken for a year group across the profile components in a subject. This could produce a single distribution for the age group in a school, for the subject as a whole, though it should still be a distribution across a set of levels. Information is lost in so collapsing data, and it involves arbitrary addition of data of different kinds: however, governors and providing agencies may need collapsed data for their own purposes. But further addition across subjects to produce cruder overall measures should be avoided, as the data so produced will be devoid of meaning.

- Finally, there is aggregation across level distributions to produce a single overall average score for a group (see paragraph 75). Again some users may want this simplification, but they should be urged to accept and use distribution data. Addition to produce average scores involves the assumption that the levels form an equal interval scale, and can hide important differences between schools in their spreads of performances.

Links with GCSE

13. The links with the GCSE grade structure proposed in Figure 1 and paragraphs 105-106 of our main report have occasioned some disquiet on grounds that they are too

prescriptive and rigid in the face of variations between subjects. There are several points to make here. First, the immediate purpose is to give subject working groups some guidance about the assumptions they should make when proposing criteria for the upper levels in our ten-level system which are relevant to the 14-16 age range. But once the criteria and levels have been settled, the actual equivalence between the national assessment of the profile components and the GCSE grades will be a matter of empirical observation of pupil performance. Secondly, there is no direct link at the outset between levels for an individual profile component and GCSE grades for a subject as a whole: the coverage is different, and much will depend on the way in which profile components are aggregated within a subject for reporting (which we refer to elsewhere). Thirdly, we had suggested in our main report two specific points of articulation: that the level 6/7 boundary should represent the median pupil performance at age 16, and that this boundary should correspond to the GCSE grade F/G boundary.

14. There is as yet no evidence about the performance of the median pupil in GCSE, and we recognise that that performance will not necessarily coincide with the F/G boundary in any or all subjects. We therefore suggest that subject working groups should define the level 6/7 boundary in terms of median pupil performance, and that the corresponding GCSE grading be determined subsequently and empirically, subject by subject. This will mean that national assessment levels 6 and 7 will not necessarily be linked to the same GCSE grade in all subjects. If, in the longer term, the links between distributions of performance in national assessment at 16 and of GCSE graded results are found to be markedly out of line across subjects, those concerned nationally will need to decide whether the discrepancy is justifiable, or whether the national assessment level criteria or GCSE grading standards or both should be adjusted in certain subjects - bearing in mind the need for public confidence in and understanding of the system.

Reporting and publication

15. Reporting and publication have caused more concern than any other single issue. The main arguments here have been:-

(a) If some schools publish certain data on an optional basis, all will eventually be forced to do so, for example in the case of publication of age 7 performance data alongside those for age 11. We accept the possibility that this might happen but we cannot see that rules either to suppress such publication or to make it obligatory can create a better situation. We do not however recommend or wish to encourage publication of results for age 7, for the reasons in paragraph 135 of our main report.

(b) Many want results to be adjusted by a formula for socio-economic and other factors. It is clear to us, for reasons given in paragraphs 125 to 138, that un-adjusted data must be published, and those making the argument do not consider the problems of explaining to users the two sets of data. We continue to prefer our recommendation in paragraph 134. We draw attention to our suggestion that secondary schools could, if they wish, publish data on performance of their age 11 intake.

(c) We draw attention to the importance of our recommendation in paragraph 134. In publishing within its own report a statement prepared for the region by a local authority, to advise parents and others about the size and significance of the general effects of socio-economic factors on performance, a school can be clear of any suspicion of special pleading about its own results. Such statements will obviously need sensitive preparation and, as they should include information on the extent of the influence of background factors on performance,

local authorities will need technical advice in their preparation. It is in this area that the continuing development of techniques of analysis of school performance indicators against background factors will make an important contribution.

(d) But the main problem is to explain the issues in terms which parents and others can understand and use to inform their judgements. We recommend that a pilot study be commissioned to prepare explanatory statements and investigate public reaction to them. This should be mounted nationally and should draw both on expert statistical advice and on advice from those skilled in public communication: it might well trial statements in a small number of localities of contrasting types.

Records of achievement

16. We re-emphasise our recommendation in paragraph 162 on the inclusion of national assessment results in a broader Record of Achievement for each pupil. The assessed aspects of the national curriculum are but part of the whole curriculum, and the Records of Achievement should offer a fuller picture.

17. Some commentators have expressed concern that in failing to stress the importance of negotiation with pupils we are in conflict with an important principle of such Records. Negotiation with a pupil about when he or she is ready for a particular assessment has been valuable in graded assessment schemes and is part of some GCSE schemes. It is also a feature of some existing systems that a pupil can be involved in decisions about the assessment tasks to be attempted, in cases where selection of the task is linked to the range of levels within which the pupil's performance is most likely to lie. Pupils could also be involved in discussing the evidence about their own work which it would be fair to select for internal assessment. All these are features through which pupils' powers

of self-assessment may be developed and utilised, and they could also serve to improve the quality of the assessment evidence. We stress, however, that the value to the pupil of the national assessment process is to give a guide about progress which has external reference and validity. If negotiation could alter the result, this value would be lost, and public confidence in national assessment distributions would be put at risk. That is not to rule out teacher/pupil dialogue which is at the heart of the initial processes of recording and reporting achievement: indeed, it reinforces the benefit of such dialogue where that starts from the attainment targets and assessment outcomes as points of reference for formative purposes.

Security and confidence in results

18. There have been questions about whether or not national assessments should occur at fixed and specified times; and about security aspects with open or confidential tests. The answers will depend upon the type of tests or assessments involved. Fixed written tests or other short assessments could be set at fixed times or within a narrow band of dates. For tasks which extend over time, however, flexibility will have to be allowed; these tasks should, like existing practical tests at 16+, be available to teachers a short time before the work starts. The materials will have to be renewed from year to year, at least in the first few years. We believe teachers will appreciate that it is not in the interest of their pupils to produce an inflated estimate of attainment because this will hide problems, create difficulties for those teaching the pupils in future years, distort evidence of future progress, and suppress useful feedback on individual and class performance. If this spirit is established, most of the problems of timing and security will be minor. The peer review used in the group moderation process should also help ensure the integrity of results.

Evaluation and review

19. The system for both curriculum and assessment will have many radically new features. It is therefore vital that it should be able to evolve and adapt in the light of experience. One particular means of feedback will be from moderation groups (paragraph 76). We have also drawn attention to evolution in relation to GCSE (paragraph 163). We wish to emphasise here the general importance of feedback and review particularly in the early years. A special factor in this context is that curriculum specifications often need to be reconsidered in the light of assessment experience. We stress our recommendation in paragraph 56 that targets should be exemplified in tasks. We also point out that, both in the phasing-in period and later, close liaison about evolution will be needed between the National Curriculum Council (NCC) and the School Examinations and Assessment Council (SEAC). Careful monitoring and evaluation, by a variety of means, will be essential.

Implications for teaching and learning

20. The implementation of the scheme of ten levels and of a criterion-referenced approach should have profound effects on the way teachers evaluate and pursue their work with pupils. The criterion-referenced aspect helps to ensure that teachers are partners in the system, since they can work to its targets in collaboration with their pupils. However, for many teachers it will mean a radical change in the way they approach their work. In particular, attention to pupil progression can be far more clearly and sharply directed. We foresee in consequence that questions of differentiated treatment for pupils of the same age might require more attention than hitherto in some subjects.

21. All of this means that careful planning is required to assess and deliver the extra training and help needed. Specific requirements for establishing national assessment and testing at ages 7, 11 and 14 can be estimated fairly closely, and we will deal with this in a further report. But if the system is to have

desirable effects on teachers' own assessments at all ages, the need is more extensive. Over time and with school-based extension of the training provided for national assessment, much could be achieved. In addition, assessment needs should be built in to most of the courses planned by LEAs and schools for broader purposes, and INSET for the national curriculum and assessment will have to continue at LEA level after the first years of the system's establishment, in order to accommodate turnover in the teaching force. We emphasise that our recommendations in paragraphs 78, 116, 117 and 169, for the provision of assessment guidance and materials additional to those needed directly at the national assessment ages, are of great importance if the full potential value of the national curriculum is to be realised. There will be short term demands placed on teachers in becoming familiar with and applying the new assessment materials and procedures in the classroom, as well as undertaking INSET outside it. We are not in a position to quantify the net effect. Nor is it possible at this stage to estimate what if any net effect there will be on teachers' workloads in the longer term when the system is fully operational and all are well versed in it. The changes should be studied as the system is implemented. The message we do wish to stress is that the systematic scheme of assessment we advocate can bring valuable benefits to teaching and learning alike.

Cross-curricular needs

22. Our proposals in paragraphs 35, 121-123 on ways of integrating profile components where appropriate across different subject areas, and providing for their evolution through successive educational stages, have attracted a favourable response. Many see a need for explicit collaboration between subject working groups to help secure a linked approach across the curriculum. We welcome the Secretary of State's response to our recommendation in paragraph 123 by setting up a Primary Sub-Group, which will be a means of tackling the problems in the 7 to 11 age range. We point out that such work will set a basis for the further development of cross-curricular profile components in

the secondary stages. The NCC and SEAC will need to oversee such developments across the whole age range.

23. There are nevertheless substantial problems here because the various working groups will start at different times and will not be able to interact. Later groups cannot influence directly the components already laid down in earlier work. We can only ask

- that working groups look ahead as far as possible and be guided in this by overall strategies adopted by the NCC and SEAC; and

- that evolutionary change of the system in the first few years be allowed as far as is possible without disrupting the process of establishing it.

Essential features of the system

24. We are aware that many commentators have found our recommendations novel and unexpected; and that some have questioned whether a simpler system would be preferable. Some have attempted to caricature our scheme as too "hard-faced" because of what they see as an oppressive commitment to external standardisation, moderation and accountability at the expense of teachers' professional skills and children's enjoyment of learning. Others, paradoxically, have categorised it as too "soft-centred" because it does not rely largely on prescribed written tests but involves some use of teachers' judgements and a sophisticated presentation of outcomes. Neither picture is true. We reaffirm the importance we attach to written tests alongside other standardised tasks and carefully structured internal assessments, externally moderated. All these elements are necessary if an adequate and reliable description is to be given of a pupil's attainments and a sound foundation laid for purposeful future learning. The balance to be struck between them may vary from subject to subject and stage to stage: it is not within our remit to recommend ideal balances, which is a

matter for individual subject working groups. The teacher-based moderating and reporting structure is designed to deliver the assessment in a cost-effective way: fair to pupils, parents, teachers and the public; and protecting both standards and professional skills.

25. Our view remains that our proposals are the only way to guarantee the following features:

- Criterion-referencing to identify specific attainment
- Progression in learning
- A formative system to guide the next steps
- Confidence in the results
- Consequent improvement of teaching and learning

No other system on its own can achieve these. Purely external methods cannot meet these criteria in the way that our system is designed to do: their results cannot be relied upon in isolation, for sound technical reasons. Yet they cannot merely be dispensed with. On the other hand, any system which does not involve the talents and professional commitment of teachers cannot improve the day-to-day work of teaching and learning. So a balance is needed.

26. Of course it is possible to conceive of simpler systems. But our analysis leads us to conclude that they would either fail to deliver what is required or prove more complex in practice as attempts were made to rectify their failings. No simpler alternative has been put forward which demonstrably achieves all the above criteria which reflect the Government's objectives in our remit. If simplicity is nonetheless desired, the question arises which of the criteria are to be abandoned, and what are the implications for the implementation of the national curriculum. That must be for others to answer. But it is our belief that the criteria are fundamental to securing those objectives, that the system we have devised to meet them stands or falls as a whole, and that removal of any of its essential features would damage the implementation of the national

curriculum. Our prime concern has been to enhance the professional work of teachers so as to improve the education of our children. We remain convinced that our proposals are crucial to ensuring that the national curriculum achieves this aim.

March 1988

TASK GROUP ON ASSESSMENT AND TESTING

SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT:
APPLICATION OF THE FRAMEWORK TO INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTS

SUMMARY

The second supplementary report records the outcome of discussions with some subject specialists on the application of the proposed assessment framework to individual subjects. There has been general agreement with our main report's proposals for the structure of attainment targets and profile components, the sequence of performance levels covering progression and differentiation, and aggregation of results within subjects. But the discussions lead the Task Group to suggest that:

(a) close liaison will be needed between subject working groups and others, both to secure appropriate consistency in the definition of profile components and to ensure that elements common to two or more subjects are suitably reflected in the subjects concerned without omission or duplication;

(b) subject working groups should pay particular attention to the balance of assessment in fields such as the arts where strands of performance are more difficult (but we believe not impossible) to appraise in isolation from the coherent whole;

(c) working groups may need to give priority to developing descriptions of progression, covering the primary phase;

(d) the groups should examine available assessment and testing items as a starting point for clarifying and developing thinking on attainment targets and profile components, particularly for the primary phase;

(e) the groups should also advise on the circumstances in which different levels of aggregation of results may be appropriate in their subjects, and how it should be done, having regard to the general principles we have enunciated;

(f) the groups should suggest how particular in-service training needs in their subjects might be met.

We believe, too, that initially it may be necessary to adopt a somewhat rough and ready approach to the establishment of profile components and levels of progression, for the sake of getting the system up and running. Pursuit of detailed perfection could delay realisation of the benefits of a national assessment system. But it is essential that all concerned should keep it under review and be ready to adapt and refine it in the light of experience.

March 1988

TASK GROUP ON ASSESSMENT AND TESTING

SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT:
APPLICATION OF THE FRAMEWORK TO INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTS

Introduction

1. In his announcement following the Task Group's main report, the Secretary of State invited the Group to continue its work, as it had suggested, in a number of areas. One area was to discuss, with subject working groups and others, more specific criteria for assessment arrangements in different subjects. This supplementary report records the outcome of these consultations, and offers some reflections.

2. The Group sought written comments on its suggested framework for assessment from all the main subject associations. It then invited a group of selected subject representatives (covering English, history, geography, and art) to a discussion session at which the School Curriculum Development Committee (SCDC) was also represented; and it obtained feedback from the Mathematics and Science Working Groups and the Kingman Committee through its continuing contacts with them. (A list of those responding in writing to the Group's invitation, and of those present at the discussion session, is attached at Appendix A.)

3. As a result of these consultations, the Task Group has reached broad conclusions on the following key aspects of its framework for assessment: profile components, progression and differentiation, assessment instruments, aggregation of results, and the readiness of subject areas.

Profile components

4. There is general agreement with our concept of the profile component, consisting of a cluster of related attainment targets, as the basic unit of assessment and reporting; and with our proposals for the desirable number of components per subject and

stage. There is also support for the proposition that the style and nature of the profile components identified in each subject should so far as possible be consistent with those of other subjects, in terms for example of scope, content and specificity. But this consideration should guide, not constrain, the deliberations of the subject working groups. There may be good reasons why the profile components in one subject should have different characteristics from those in others; but the difference should be demonstrably justified in relation to distinctive features of the subject. This points to a need for close liaison between concurrent subject working groups, and for suitable guidance by the Secretary of State and/or National Curriculum Council for future working groups.

5. Similarly, where aspects of a profile component seem likely to be common to two or more subjects, a co-ordinating mechanism of some such kind will be needed to decide to which subjects they should be allocated, or how they could or should be shared between the subjects while avoiding unnecessary duplication. Language is the most obvious example. Here we suggest that the subject working group for English should be asked to consider which components, relating to written and oral communication skills, should be regarded as common to some or all other identified subjects, as well as those which would be appropriate only to English as such. For other instances of overlap where there is no obvious "lead" subject working group to offer corresponding advice or where timing may present problems, guidance may be needed from the Secretary of State or NCC. In this general connection, we should clear up an apparent misunderstanding over paragraph 35 of our main report. We did not intend that all subjects should subscribe to exactly the same entities in order to create single profile components across the whole curriculum. Instead we had in mind the position described above.

6. There has been some concern about the practicability of identifying and assessing separate profile components for subjects such as art and music, where pupils' work is seen to be

holistic in nature. But we are satisfied that it is possible to devise tasks of a holistic kind which still allow the identification of separate elements for assessment purposes without jeopardising the coherence of the whole. For example, in music the strands of composing, performing, listening and criticism might be separated. Another issue is the extent to which pupils' understanding of concepts and rules can be assessed in isolation from their performance in specific tasks and contexts, and therefore without being coloured by the choice of tasks: a matter raised in the case of language but with implications elsewhere. We consider that the variety of standard assessment tasks and other instruments available will be sufficient to sample enough of pupils' responses under different conditions, together with their own explanations of their work, to provide an adequate account of these facets. But we recommend subject working groups to pay particular attention to this issue in those areas where it seems likely to be most significant.

Progression and differentiation

7. We have found general acceptance for our concept of progression, defined in terms of a sequence of up to 10 levels spanning the range of performance from ages 5 to 16 in each profile component; and for our proposition that relevant segments of the same sequence of levels could also be used to differentiate between varying qualities of performance at any one reporting age. No difficulties of principle are anticipated in applying this framework to individual subjects: it does not depend on empirical evidence of a particular linear (or other) pattern of learning for its initial construction, although the definitions of the levels may need to be reviewed in individual cases in the light of information about the actual distribution of pupils' performance when the national curriculum and assessment system are in operation.

8. We are aware, however, that it will generally be easiest to develop and implement sequences of levels embodying appropriate progression for the 14-16 age group, where a good deal of

experience and knowledge is already available as a result of work related to the GCSE and other developments. At the other extreme, application to the primary stage (7-11) will represent a considerable challenge, given what is known about the nature of children's early learning and the organisation of the primary curriculum. Subject working groups should plan their deliberations with these factors in mind.

Assessment Instruments

9. Subject working groups should also be strongly encouraged to attempt to collect or generate relevant assessment and testing items very early in their work. We believe this will help them to clarify the meanings of profile components and attainment targets at an early stage of their discussions. Our experience is that the interaction between novel statements of aims and the attempt to express these in explicit assessment form will be extremely valuable. We stress that these will be particularly important in areas, such as the primary stage, where little has been studied in some subjects and the formulation of appropriate targets and components is to proceed without precedents or traditions for guidance. In drawing attention to this point we are repeating and reinforcing the recommendation and arguments contained in paragraph 56 of our main report.

Aggregation of assessment results

10. While there has been general support for our conclusions regarding the aggregation of assessment results, some concern has been expressed by some subject specialists about the dangers of oversimplification or misinterpretation arising from the aggregation of results within a subject for individual pupils, or across groups of pupils as an indicator of class or school performance. We deal more fully, in our first supplementary report, with this and the related issue of socio-economic and other influences on institutional performance. As regards aggregation within subjects, we have found no reason to suppose that the principles we have suggested for clustering attainment

targets into profile components will prove inconsistent with reporting a sufficiently detailed, balanced yet manageable picture of performance in the main elements of each subject. For most, perhaps all, purposes it will be necessary to report performance on each profile component separately; for some it may exceptionally be necessary to aggregate results across components within a subject. We suggest that subject working groups should advise on the circumstances in which these different levels of aggregation may be appropriate in their subject, on how attainment targets should be weighted in profile components, on how components should be weighted when aggregating, and on what guidance should be given about the interpretation of the aggregates.

Readiness of individual subject areas

11. The main elements of novelty in our proposals concern the articulation of progression, the understanding of the assessment concepts involved, and the ability to construct and use the necessary assessment instruments. In some subjects and for some stages, teachers and the system generally are likely to be better prepared to respond to these than in others. Nevertheless, there is general recognition of the need for widespread and thorough training of staff at all levels in the concepts and skills involved. In-service training will be crucial: we deal with this more fully elsewhere. We suggest here that subject working groups might consider what particular needs there are in their area, and how they might best be met.

General conclusions

12. The response to the Task Group's main report from the subject representatives and associations has been generally positive and welcoming in tone. In considering the application of the framework to particular subject areas, we believe it is recognised that there would - at least initially - be a need to compromise: to adopt where necessary a fairly rough and ready approach to the establishment of profile components and levels of

progression. Seeking to be too precise at the outset would run the risk of getting bogged down in detail, with a consequent delay and loss of both motivation and credibility. Where the need for continuous adaptation and modification was well-recognised, we believe it would be acceptable to adopt a broad-brush approach for the sake of getting the new system "up and running", so that it could indeed be tested in practice and modified in the light of experience. But it will call for regular and careful review, and willingness to amend, on the part of the DES, NCC and SEAC.

March 1988

APPENDIX A

CONSULTATIONS WITH SUBJECT REPRESENTATIVES

Written Responses:

National Association for the Teaching of English
Geographical Association
Historical Association
Association of Advisers in Craft Design and Technology
The Schools Music Association
UK Home Economics Federation

Subject representatives attending discussion with TGAT on 27 February 1988:-

History

HMI Mr J A Hamer
Mr D Shemilt

Geography

Mr R D Daugherty

Art

Dr R McClone
Mr M Ross

English

Mr R Knott
Mrs J Taylor

SCDC

Mr P Watkins

Mathematics Working Group

(Observer)
Professor Hugh Burkhardt

TASK GROUP ON ASSESSMENT AND TESTING

THIRD SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT:
A SYSTEM OF SUPPORT

SUMMARY

The Task Group's main report submitted at Christmas 1987 proposed a more detailed study than had then been possible of the system of support needed for its proposed national assessment framework. The Secretary of State agreed that the Group should continue this work. This third supplementary report presents its conclusions on implementation, administration and support of the system.

The report sets out the general criteria which the organisational structure should meet, and the functions of each body in the system. It goes on to recommend a structure which involves a regional tier between the national agencies and the district-level moderating groups of up to 20 schools. The regional tier would consist of up to a dozen consortia in England, formed by GCSE Groups and LEAs in partnership, and responsible for the coordination of assessment procedures (including moderation), monitoring and evaluation, curriculum development and relevant in-service training in their areas. Arrangements for developing, trialling and supplying assessment instruments to schools are also set out in the report.

In-service training (and, in the longer term, revised initial teacher training for new entrants) will be essential. The report proposes an immediate awareness programme for headteachers in 1988-89, and action programmes of training for primary and secondary teachers to prepare them for continuous assessment, administering standard tasks or tests, and moderation from 1989-90 onwards, using a "cascade" process based on GCSE training experience.

A case study shows how, in a typical LEA, resources currently devoted to in-service training for other purposes could to a large extent be redeployed in support of the national curriculum and assessment: the amount required for this represents only a small proportion of current total in-service provision. The report does not attempt to estimate the financial cost of its proposals, partly because much will depend on the nature and type of assessment instruments and materials, and the amount of novelty in the curriculum. But the main point it makes is that the bulk of the support and training resource requirements will arise as a consequence of the national curriculum itself, whatever assessment regime accompanies it; and it would be misleading to try to cost the latter as if it were independent of and additional to the former. The Group notes that the Government has made provision for the national curriculum and assessment in its announced public expenditure plans for 1988-89 onwards.

March 1988

TASK GROUP ON ASSESSMENT AND TESTING

THIRD SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT: A SYSTEM OF SUPPORT

INTRODUCTION

1. Our main report submitted to the Secretary of State at Christmas 1987 included a section (paragraphs 200 to 218) headed "A System of Support". That section closed with the following statement in paragraph 218:

> "The problems and prospects considered in the last few sections of our report will require further and more detailed examination than we have been able to give so far. We propose to continue work on them and to produce a supplementary report. For this reason we make no substantive recommendations on these issues at this stage."

The Secretary of State agreed that we should continue work on the arrangements for implementation, administration and support of national assessment. This third supplementary report presents our conclusions.

2. Although our remit is concerned with assessment and testing, it is not possible to discuss the system of support except in the broader context of the implementation of the national curriculum as a whole. Our recommendations have to consider this broader context because we believe that curriculum needs should set the priorities for assessment work. Thus, whilst we have concentrated on the support requirements for an assessment and testing system, we have considered these as part of the wider development of the national curriculum wherever appropriate. As a further consequence we have not produced specific costings of our proposals. Much of the assessment activity undertaken by teachers will help to exemplify and explore the requirements of the national curriculum; and the moderation process will raise their awareness of a range of

approaches to its implementation. To treat these activities just as direct costs of assessment, strictly comparable to the costs of externally set and marked tests, is to ignore the prime aim of effective implementation of the curriculum.

3. We present our recommendations below in Sections A to E.

- In Section A we outline the general criteria which a system should satisfy.

- In Section B we discuss the application of these to agencies responsible for policy and provision at national level.

- In Section C we consider the requirements that arise at local level in meeting directly the needs of schools.

- In Section D we discuss the question of the need for regional agencies which might operate between the national and local bodies.

- Section E examines the particular problem of in-service training for teachers.

We conclude with some general observations on resource implications and the scope for redeployment.

4. Our discussion assumes that the national system is phased in over a period as recommended in our main report; and that year 1 will be 1989-90 for science and mathematics, and possibly also for English, in the first two key stages of the national curriculum, and 1989-90 for science and mathematics in the third key stage. We make no particular assumptions about other subjects or stages in our illustrative figures, given that subject working groups to recommend attainment targets currently exist only for science and mathematics (although some work has

been done on aspects of English language by the Kingman Committee).

5. We make no separate recommendations about resources. For the needs implied in the recommendations of Sections B, C and D below, which draw heavily on existing machinery and systems, we have presumed that adequate provision can be made. For in-service training, the needs are potentially much greater and so we discuss possible resource implications in Section E and our concluding observations. Our figures have been prepared on an England-only basis. We have not presumed that they will necessarily translate proportionately to Wales, since geographical and organisational differences may point to alternative patterns there. References to the National Curriculum Council (NCC) should however be taken to apply to its Welsh counterpart (CCW) where appropriate.

SECTION A: CRITERIA FOR A SYSTEM

6. The most important criteria are set out below. The first group are criteria that would apply to any system, as follows:-

(i) There must be clear allocation of responsibilities.

(ii) Optimum use of human and financial resources must be ensured, particularly by

- avoiding overlap and duplication of effort
- using existing structures, agencies and expertise, wherever appropriate
- designing feedback and evaluation channels into the structure so that the system can adapt and evolve, particularly in the early years.

The second group of criteria is concerned with the structure of

the system, as follows:-

(iii) The system should be so set up and operated as to have sensitive regard to its limited role, because

- the national curriculum and assessment are but part of the whole school curriculum, and of assessment and certification at 16
- implementation of national curriculum objectives depends on their delivery through action in classrooms.

Teachers, schools, LEAs and the national agencies will have other responsibilities that are broader than those set by the national curriculum and assessment systems.

(iv) There must be co-ordination, exercised through national agencies, including the NCC and School Examinations and Assessment Council (SEAC). In particular they should:

- draw on a wide range of expert advice
- give Council members opportunity to take full part in work so that they can make a real contribution to policy
- contract out work to existing agencies who already have appropriate resources and skills
- be so structured that consideration of policy issues is not submerged by the burden of administration.

(v) Between the national level and the individual school there should be suitable intermediate tiers.

The third group of criteria focusses on the functions of the system:-

(vi) Close and reciprocal links between curriculum policies and developments, assessment policies and developments, and design and delivery of INSET, must be maintained, at national and at other levels.

(vii) Delegation is needed to limit bureaucratic complexity, and to ensure responsiveness to and understanding of regional and local needs. Collation of feedback and evaluation data to inform national policy is however also essential.

(viii) The operation of assessment procedures at 7, 11, 14 and 16 should pay regard to the need for overall consistency between the work at the four reporting ages, and to the need for consistency across the curriculum as a whole. Such consistency should stress

- the formative role of all assessments reported on at 7, 11 and 14
- their criterion-referenced nature, across the ages
- the single structure of levels across the ages in related profile components, and
- hence, the emphasis on progression.

In particular, therefore, group moderation at the four ages must work to a common overall scheme.

SECTION B: THE NATIONAL LEVEL

7. In this section, we discuss functions which ought to be carried out for the country as a whole, and consider the organisations that should have responsibility for them.

8. The policy on which the system as a whole is based has to be issued and defined by one body, in this case the DES. Their overall responsibilities in relation to the education service as a whole, for policy on initial training and INSET, for co-ordination of curriculum and assessment, and for collecting and interpreting evaluation and feedback, means that they could have a strong coordinating role. We believe, however, that if none of this co-ordination work is delegated, then the Department might find it difficult to exercise policy oversight and to steer the system effectively.

9. The general curriculum and assessment policies need to be translated into plans for the particular subjects and the several stages of the system, and the work of carrying out these plans has to be organised and contracted out. The proposed National Curriculum Council, the Curriculum Council for Wales and the School Examinations and Assessment Council will share responsibility for these functions. They will need to interact closely, both on general policy, and at subject level. Responsibility should be delegated to joint subject committees, and there should also be joint coordinating committees for the primary stages and for the secondary and GCSE work. In assessment work, both the SEAC and the DES will operate more effectively if the DES delegates as many of the relevant coordinating functions as possible.

10. There will be a need to plan and implement a very large programme of INSET, and the task will be an urgent one. For this task, the co-ordination required between the DES, with their overall responsibility for strategy and funding, NCC, SEAC, local education authorities and perhaps regional consortia (as discussed in Section D below) will mean that a central arrangement will be needed, at least for the first few years of phasing in the new system. There will also be a corresponding need for the adaptation of initial teacher training. Although the impact here on the teaching force will be more gradual and long term, it is important that teachers newly entering the profession should be equipped to cope with the new curriculum and

assessment requirements. An early start should be made so that those now in training can benefit, with particular attention to the core subjects. The DES and training providers will need to oversee a national programme of adaptation.

11. The instruments for assessment and testing, whether for the formal national assessment or for supporting teacher-based assessments and diagnostic work, will have to be created and refined in school trials. For this purpose, several different agencies should be invited to take part, and competitive tendering should be adopted, with particular attention to quality. A range of groups and institutions should be used, perhaps with changed assignments from time to time, to ensure innovation and variety in the methods. Contracts should stipulate trials of administration and marking in schools, and responsibility to produce INSET materials with the test instruments (including examples of pupils' work for assessment training).

12. The storage of test items, a selection from them for particular assessments according to the assessment policy, and the reproduction and distribution of assessment and testing instruments, might efficiently be carried out on a national scale by a body equipped for these functions.

13. Comprehensive evaluation and feedback will be essential to the proper development and continuing quality of the system. One important channel for this process depends on local groups and is discussed below. Another will derive from collation and interpretation of the national assessment results. This again should work through local and regional agencies: there will need to be collection, analysis and interpretation of their data and reporting of the outcomes before further analysis and interpretation at national level. Responsibility for carrying out or contracting out this work should rest with the SEAC.

14. The Assessment of Performance Unit should continue its present role, with national monitoring and associated in-depth

research as at present. Whilst the Unit's strategy will have to be adapted to match the national curriculum and assessment, it should be noted that its monitoring surveys give a far more comprehensive and detailed picture of pupils' performance in a subject than the proposed national assessment system could, or should, provide. They also furnish valuable materials for teachers' use in the classroom. The APU could assist the overall evaluation by setting the national assessment results in a more detailed and ample picture of pupils' performance. This purpose might indicate a shift of the APU's priority, from the large scale survey needed for nationally representative data, to more intensive work with smaller samples to yield the detailed picture.

15. Evaluation and feedback also need information of different kinds. HMI and local authority inspectors and advisers can provide evidence of the quality of classroom work and school organisation, the former particularly and directly designed for reporting at national level.

16. The work of HMI and APU must also be addressed to the Secretary of State, since both will be evaluating the system as a whole. The other functions should be designed and operated by collaboration between the NCC and the SEAC. The range of types of information that could be useful is broader than the above discussion might indicate, and both the methodology for collecting informative data and the interpretation of the data can raise formidable problems. The NCC, the CCW and the SEAC will have at least to consult HMI, the DES and other agencies, particularly the LEAs and the MSC, in formulating their strategy.

17. The task of formulating recommended attainment targets, programmes of study and the assessment strategy for each foundation subject would, we assume, generally be assigned to a subject working group set up at national level by the DES. The subsequent handling of the proposals would be undertaken through consultation with and by the NCC leading eventually to statutory introduction as set out in the Education Reform Bill. As noted

above, two core subject working groups - mathematics and science - are already in existence, and we understand others are to follow.

SECTION C: THE LOCAL LEVEL

18. The proposals in our main report for moderation require that teachers from local groups of schools meet together. The groupings need to be established and the meetings organised. The conduct of the meetings will have to be coordinated with the INSET programme, and those chairing them will need special training. The data produced in preparation for meetings, in the meetings themselves, and feedback information on the national tasks and procedures, will have to be collected and transmitted. These functions should be carried out by Local Groups, who will have close links with and support from LEAs and other providing institutions. Such Groups could be operated by the LEAs, acting in collaboration where necessary, and should be equipped to draw upon and use local knowledge in organising their work and in interpreting results. Their optimum size and boundaries will have to be determined in relation to local and regional needs. Each Moderating Group could bring together about 15 schools (class teachers at primary level, subject teachers at secondary), and a Local Group might administer about 20 such groups at primary level and the corresponding number (about 4) at secondary level. Each Local Group could have a monitoring and communication role on INSET, and a coordinating role between curriculum, assessment and INSET developments. A group should be large enough that results averaged over its range of schools would be fairly representative and stable over time, and small enough for real cooperation on curriculum and INSET work. It is significant that LEAs much smaller than our proposed group size have found it necessary to collaborate, whilst those much larger have found it necessary to set up local sub-structures.

SECTION D: REGIONAL LEVELS

19. The various functions which the system has to carry out may be summarised as follows:-

(a) Implementing and further developing the national curriculum.

(b) Carrying out national assessment, including moderation procedures.

(c) Monitoring and evaluating the operation of (a) and (b).

(d) Organising, delivering and monitoring those aspects of INSET related to implementation of the national curriculum and assessment policies.

(e) Managing the organisation of (a) to (d) above.

20. We recommend that these functions should be carried out by regional agencies but think that it will be helpful if our description of appropriate organisations is prefaced by some exploration of:

(i) the possibility of managing without any intermediate tier between the national organisations and the Local Groups;

(ii) the possibility of using only ad hoc intermediate bodies; and

(iii) the potentialities and limitations of the GCSE Groups as they now exist.

In dealing with each of these issues we have assumed that the present GCSE Groups will continue to have responsibility for the GCSE.

Scope for eliminating regional tier

21. If there are no regional structures, then the implications for functions (a) to (e) may be summarised as follows.

(i) For 7, 11 and 14, the National Councils and other agencies would have to deal directly with the 97 local education authorities who should assume responsibility for Local Groups. There would be no easy way to coordinate with GCSE.

(ii) The same considerations as for (a) apply to curriculum work. Here, opportunities would be restricted by the small scale of Local Group and LEA operations, and some LEAs may find it hard to supply adequate staff expertise for leadership in curriculum and assessment work. On the other hand, they could link primary and secondary work and coordinate the activities under (a), (b) and (d).

(iii) For monitoring and evaluation, the LEA is a natural unit for aggregating data and for taking some of the responsibility for evaluation.

(iv) For organisation of INSET, some LEAs would be rather too small to deal with the "steep cascade" model of delivery that would be needed in the first years (see Section E below).

(v) There would be a minimum number of tiers, but the directness of the link of Local Groups with the National Councils would be accompanied by substantial administrative burdens on these Councils.

Scope for ad hoc structures

22. Some of the difficulties that might arise in the absence of established regional structures could be met by ad hoc structures. Some of the considerations affecting this are as follows:

(i) For age 16, the existing arrangements would continue. But separate ad hoc arrangements for 7, 11 and 14 could entail dual structures which would then have to be in close communication to ensure coherence, particularly between 14 and 16.

(ii) For curriculum development, it is worth noting that various curriculum projects in the past have found it necessary to create regional structures in order to coordinate their work with groups of LEAs and to maintain effective local contacts. A recent example is the Secondary Science Curriculum Review.

(iii) For monitoring and evaluation, there would be coordination difficulties between the GCSE groups and any other ad hoc groups performing this function in respect of the younger ages. On the other hand, a regional tier seems necessary if the evaluation of the LEA's own operations is not to be left entirely in its own hands, or discussed in a forum too large either to draw on local knowledge of LEAs, or to promote useful contacts between them.

(iv) For INSET, local consortia of LEAs, bringing in the institutions of higher education, would seem feasible and necessary.

(v) A flexible system would leave the National Councils dealing, for some functions, directly with 97 LEAs, yet for others with a small number of different bodies for different purposes.

Scope for GCSE Groups

23. The continuance of the GCSE Groups as the bodies awarding GCSE certifications can be expected to maintain public confidence in the certification processes and in the general standards of the awards. Through their GCE board members the Groups are linked to the A and AS level courses and certificates. The Groups have experience in assessment and moderation and have developed appropriate organisations for this work. This range of activities means that the NCC and SEAC will need to work with these Groups. That work may be assisted by the sub-structures within each Group, arising in the main from their creation from GCE and CSE Boards, with a range of offices and traditions of local operation.

24. The present operation of the GCSE is however not ideal. Although inter-Group competition has provided some freedom of choice, it has also led to a duplication of effort which, in some cases, has wasted the rare resources of good examining talent whilst also weakening regional identity. The Groups do not have any experience of working with primary schools and indeed in some cases have little knowledge of the early years of secondary education. Not all Groups are involved in the development of Records of Achievement, and the relationships with LEAs vary in depth and nature.

25. These various considerations lead us to two conclusions: we must use the GCSE Groups within the system, as an intermediate tier between the national organisation and the local groups; but their role cannot be an exclusive one, particularly as curricular issues are involved and because there must be a continuum from 7-16.

Recommended regional structure

26. We therefore recommend that regional agencies should be set up with responsibilities for the curriculum, assessment and INSET

coordination. We believe that these agencies would best be formed by partnership between a consortium of LEAs and the corresponding GCSE Group. The features of such a system may be summarised as follows:

(a) The work at 7, 11, 14 and 16 could be handled in a single system unified with GCSE. It could be one system for all ages, but without necessarily requiring activities and contracts at primary level to be undertaken by the GCSE Groups who lack experience at this level and whose scale of operation may be inappropriate for the large numbers of schools involved.

(b) If the same agencies supported curriculum development, they could play a regional role of the kind that has been found essential in national projects. They could also support local initiatives, particularly in helping with procedures for exemption from aspects of the national curriculum or national assessment requirements which a school experimenting with curriculum innovation might seek.

(c) For monitoring and evaluation, such bodies could appraise work of LEAs and local groups. They could interpret data in the light of local knowledge, in discussion with those involved and in the light of knowledge of curriculum and INSET factors which might bear on interpretation of assessment and other forms of feedback. The feedback derived from moderation meetings collected by Local Groups could well be summarised at this level, for recommendation to LEAs, and for transmission to the National Councils.

(d) These same consortia could be of an appropriate size to organise INSET, using a "steep cascade" model and involving all institutions in a region who should contribute (see Section E below).

(e) If National Councils and other national agencies could delegate to regional agencies, their capacity to concentrate on policy would be enhanced. Schools and Local Groups would have much shorter lines of communication than any National Councils could provide, with agencies which could give advice and interpretation, and which could receive critical feedback.

(f) We envisage that any schools with grant maintained status would retain full membership of the procedures open to LEA schools; and that independent schools and CTCs should have the right to take part on payment of appropriate fees.

27. In order to establish these new bodies, the NCC (or the CCW) and SEAC should invite bids for contracts. Such invitations should specify the functions - of combining work on curriculum, assessment at all four ages, and associated consultation and review on INSET - to be delegated jointly by the Councils. Bids could be submitted, either by a partnership between a consortium of contiguous LEAs and the corresponding GCSE Group, or by a consortium of contiguous LEAs which had made satisfactory sub-contracting arrangements with the GCSE Group of their region.

28. The terms of the contract should specify that the partnerships or consortia should show that:

(i) their organisation was flexible and efficient in providing for a ready flow of two-way traffic in ideas and materials between the regional centre and the individual schools;

(ii) teachers were properly represented in the committees of the organisation, particularly in those concerned with the curriculum and matters of assessment;

(iii) representatives of further and higher education and of industry and commerce would be involved at appropriate levels of the organisation.

Given the recommendation in our main report that Records of Achievement should be a vehicle for recording and reporting the achievements of individual pupils in the national curriculum, we would also hope that the national arrangements being developed for Records of Achievement will enable LEAs to integrate them harmoniously with the operation of the national assessment functions above.

29. It would help rationalisation of the system if schools were allowed to enter for GCSE only with their regional GCSE group - provided, however, that the Groups were then placed under some limited obligation, monitored by the SEAC, to make available examinations of other Groups on an inter-group arrangement. Groups might even buy in GCSE examination papers and procedures from one another, just as the consortia would carry out national assessment with instruments provided by expert agencies on contract. We note that the existing GCSE fee system operates so as to foster competition and choice. Our proposals above would have implications for that aspect which will require further study by the DES and others concerned.

30. There will be particular problems about organisation of INSET. Some coordinating and review powers will need to be given to the consortia in order that timely delivery of the necessary INSET can be guaranteed. But executive responsibility for these aspects of the total INSET activity in their areas can hardly be taken completely away from local education authorities. Arrangements will need to be made, with associated funding mechanisms, to ensure that, in discharging their INSET responsibilities, LEAs operate within a coordinating framework set by the consortia and linked to the work of Local Groups.

31. If we start from the four broad regions of the GCSE Groups in England, each Group might be partners in two or three

consortia, giving between 8 and 12 such consortia. Each such consortium should be composed of around 4 or 5 Local Groups: this number should not be too small, lest particular groups (eg one or two that are identical with large LEAs) dominate the rest. Each of the Local Groups would then serve between 3 and 4 Moderating Groups for secondary work in each subject and between 15 and 20 such groups for primary schools. The arithmetic is as follows:

Level	Number per level	National Total (England)
GCSE Group	4	4 Groups
Consortium	2 to 3 per GCSE Group	8 to 12 Consortia
Local Groups (LG)	4 to 5 per consortium	up to 60 LGs
Moderating Group (MG)		
Secondary	3 to 4 per LG	up to 240 MGs
Secondary Schools	15 to 20 per MG	approx 4,500 schools
Moderating Group		
Primary	15 to 20 per LG	up to 1,200 MGs
Primary Schools	15 to 20 per MG	approx 20,000 schools

SECTION E: IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR TEACHERS

Awareness programme for headteachers

32. We turn now to the in-service training needs of teachers. The first requirement is for an awareness programme for headteachers of all schools, but with particular priority for primary and middle schools covering the 7 and 11 year old reporting stages (some 20,000 maintained schools in all) - because they are less likely to be familiar with the assessment process envisaged. This should amount to one day's in-service training to underline the main changes that are to take place. Headteachers should have the opportunity to raise questions about the general implications for their schools. Their attention should be drawn to the need for each school to arrange for the national curriculum to be fitted into its whole curriculum; and

to the responsibilities of teachers in deciding how their teaching is to be adapted to ensure that their work with pupils meets the requirements of the national curriculum. Headteachers should also be told of the action that is subsequently to be taken in supporting teachers in the introduction of the curriculum and the associated assessment procedures. Local education authorities should be responsible for implementing much of this programme, though there may be a need to provide nationally a short course-handbook and some model programmes for guidance. Working parties of LEA Advisers and HMI might be best placed to produce these. This programme should be carried out during the school year 1988-89, and certainly by Easter 1989 so that, before September 1989, discussion can take place in schools on the basis of the course documents and such statutory Orders relating to attainment targets and programmes of study as are available.

In-service training requirements for primary school teachers

33. All primary school teachers will need to be trained to adapt their teaching to the national curriculum and its assessment programme. It will not be enough to rely on published material to acquaint teachers with the programmes of study, the attainment targets and the assessment system. The training for the assessment system should be linked with training for the programmes of work and attainment targets. The national curriculum will not be the whole curriculum, but it will be a substantial part of it. We take the view that all who make arrangements for in-service training for teachers, including teachers themselves through school-focussed provision, will need to consider how these can help them to prepare for the forthcoming national curriculum and its assessment programme. We assume that the national curriculum and its associated activities will continue to influence the content of in-service training for the foreseeable future.

34. The plans set out below assume that the first national curriculum specifications are settled before the start of the

1989-90 school year. In practice, this will only be true for a few subjects, and our assumptions on these are set out in paragraph 4 of this supplementary report. Later work on other subjects may mean that the primary tasks and tests may have to be modified, and therefore the whole programme may extend over a longer period. But we do not think that adaptations will add substantially to the scale of operation needed for the initial establishing of the programme, and the estimates below do not allow for such adaptation work.

35. We recommend that this training is arranged on a cascade model with as few steps as is practicable, and that the training takes place in two parts as follows:-

(a) Preparation for continuous assessment

The first part, during 1989-90, should be for three days and be aimed at relating the programmes of work and the attainment targets to continuous assessment, including the keeping of records. It will be important to complete this part of the training during the school year 1989-90, and preferably early rather than later in that year, so that the continuous assessment procedure is in place - at least for mathematics, science and English - from near the beginning of the use of the programmes of study and attainment targets for those subjects in primary and middle schools.

(b) Preparation for the tasks and reporting

This second part should be concerned with the conduct of the standard tasks, the assessment of children's performance in them, and the moderation procedures. It should be timed to allow teachers, with their pupils, to take part in a dummy run of the standard assessment procedure, and should cover four days in total. Two days should be given to familiarising

teachers with tasks, for conducting the dummy run and for assessing what children do when engaged on the tasks; a third day should be given to a moderation meeting aimed at calibrating teachers' assessments (providing a model for the full moderation meetings in future years); and a fourth day to drawing lessons from the procedures adopted. The results of assessments made for the dummy run should not be published. This second part of the training should take place in the "dummy run" period preceding that in which the first formal reporting of results is to take place. That is, for teachers concerned with the 7 year old reporting stage, we assume this second part of training would take place in the Spring and Summer of 1991 (school year 1990-91); and for teachers concerned with the 11 year old stage, in the Spring and Summer of 1993 (school year 1992-93). It is plainly essential that examples of tasks are available in time for these second parts of the training programme.

Cascade arrangements for training for primary continuous assessment: 1989-90

36. We recommend that the first, 1989-90, part of the action programme should be arranged so that two teachers should be trained from every school with children in either or both of the first two reporting stages. There is evidence from the current in-service training programmes that heads and teachers find it advantageous for at least two teachers from a school to attend a course in order that the results of that course can be well reported and acted upon. If the first part of the programme is to be completed within a school year, and the number of steps in the cascade is to be kept to a minimum, then the following pattern of training is indicated:-

(i) Preliminary training team

Preliminary training group of 10 people appointed, who will run courses in teams of 5. The group runs 14 x three day courses for 40 people per course = 560 people trained, who then form the main training group. The preliminary training team will need to be appointed and themselves trained and supplied with materials during the Summer 1989 term of school year 1988-89.

(ii) Main training team

The 560 should operate in 120 groups of four, the remaining 80 individuals at any one time being in reserve. The groups should be re-formed from course to course so that experience is spread. Each individual should be expected to take on about 10 courses per year. Each course would provide for 30 to 40 teachers (ie two moderating groups each of 15 to 20 schools). These courses will closely mirror actual practice in which the moderation meeting, itself a major source of INSET, will be run by a single individual. It may therefore be preferable that, in this dry run phase, each course should for some purposes be sub-divided into two, each half to be run by 2 people, one shadowing the activity of the other. Such a split may anyway be necessary to deal separately with distinctive features of 7 and 11 year old work. Given the demand on each trained person of 10 courses per year the main training teams of about 120 groups of four could handle 1200 courses altogether, sufficient to serve the 1200 moderating groups envisaged in paragraph 31.

(iii) In School

The two representatives from each school will subsequently have to train their colleagues in school.

The overall pattern of work in the first part of the training programme in 1989-90 can be summarised as follows:-

Autumn	Spring	Summer
Number of teachers trained:		
15,000	13,000	13,000
		Total: 41,000
Number of 3 day courses:		
430	370	370
		Total: 1,170

Each trainer will have to take part in 10 courses at 3 days per course, giving 30 days in all or about 10 days in each term.

Middle schools should be included towards the end of the training year, because they will largely be beginning the national curriculum later than others. The in-school training of the rest of the teachers for continuous assessment should take place during the Spring and Summer terms of 1989-90 and the Autumn term of 1990-91.

Cascade arrangements for training for primary tasks and moderating: 1990-91 onwards

37. These arrangements might follow the same general form, except that fewer schools need to be dealt with in a year.

(i) **Arrangements for 1990-91**

The number of schools that must be supported in the Spring and Summer terms of 1991 is:

Schools with 6 year olds and not 10* year olds:	about 5,600
Schools with 6 and 10 year olds:	about 10,500

* ie have passed their 6th or 10th birthday by the first day of the school year.

It is still desirable that at least two teachers attend from all except perhaps the smallest (2 and 3 teacher) schools, so the target population is something like 30,000 teachers, especially if one accepts that every teacher of 7 year olds should attend (ie all teachers in a vertically grouped infant school). The period for training is necessarily shorter. This is because it is undesirable to subject the children even to the dummy run tasks much before the summer term in the year they reach seven; and because of the timing of the production of the tasks, the availability of which is essential for training the main training force, let alone the teachers themselves. The training of the main training force should take place in the early Spring term 1991, and they should be asked to undertake 4 courses each between about March and July of the same year, remembering that each course is of two periods of 2 days, ie 16 days in total per person. If intended course sizes are kept to 40, with the possibility of creeping up to 50 as a maximum to allow for schools with more than two teachers of 7 year olds, then 750 courses are required. That calls for a main training team of about 950 which suggests an initial training team of at least 20, rather than 10, for this part.

(ii) Arrangements for 1991-92

The numbers of schools with 10 year olds is as follows:

10 year olds but not 6 year olds:	about 4,200
10 year olds and 6 year olds:	about 10,500

The size of the training need is slightly smaller so far as the number of schools is concerned, but the number of teachers in the schools is larger, some 155,000 teachers in schools covering the older age groups, as against about 135,000 in those covering the younger (ie the total number of teachers in schools with 6 and/or 10 year olds is about 200,000, the 90,000 in schools with both 6 and 10 year olds being counted twice in the separate figures for both age groups). For all practical purposes, it is probably sensible to repeat this year the arrangements for the previous year, except that the initial training team will probably require three rather than four days training, because the general nature of the procedures and tasks and the moderation processes will be familiar to them. There can be no such assumption about the main training team, which may be drawn from a different range of advisers, teacher trainers and perhaps teachers.

Primary phase training: summary

38. To sum up, the annual sequence of primary phase training would be:

Year 1 Preparation for continuous assessment

In school year 1989-90, national curriculum introduced in core subjects for first and second key

educational stages. 3 days training each for 2 teachers per primary school, in the curriculum and its continuous assessment. They in turn provide in-school training for their other colleagues.

Year 2 Preparation for tasks and reporting

In 1990-91, 4 days training each for 2 teachers per school covering age 7, for trial implementation of assessment tasks. Subsequent in-school training as before.

Year 3

In 1991-92, corresponding training for teachers in schools covering age 11.

First operational use of age 7 assessment and reporting (with that for age 11 following in a subsequent year).

In-Service training requirements for secondary teachers

39. In-service training for assessment in the secondary phase will be differently geared from that for primary teachers. It will need to focus on separate subjects (though cross-curricular profile components will require particular attention). Subject specialists may be expected to be familiar with the full range of the subject matter, and many of them will have undergone in-service training in preparation for the GCSE, with up-to-date approaches to assessment, including moderation practice. Nevertheless specific training will be necessary, and the experience of preparation for GCSE suggests that the training will be the more effective (and more economical) if the training for the programmes of study, the attainment targets and the assessment related to them is done in harness. The phasing-in of attainment targets and programmes of study for the foundation subjects means that training itself can be readily phased; it is

axiomatic that it cannot take place until those elements have been defined and promulgated. GCSE experience suggests clearly that it is essential that the trainers should have, and should make full use of, assessment task materials of the quality and nature of those which will be employed in operation.

40. As in the primary phase, the elements of training will cover the programmes of study; the attainment targets; the role and practice of internal assessment and its recording; the place and conduct of the standard assessment tasks (tests); the moderating process; the alignment of moderated internal assessment and test results; and the reporting of the assessments. Initially for the secondary phase the training will concentrate on reporting at age 14 since it is likely that assessment and reporting of non-examined subjects at 16 can be catered for by using other tasks designed for reporting at 14 including Levels 8 and 9.

41. As before, a 'cascade model' is envisaged involving three phases:

- phase 1: selecting and training the trainers (subject experts);
- phase 2: trainers training nominated subject teachers (perhaps heads of department);
- phase 3: teachers training colleagues in their schools.

42. For phase 1 we propose selecting and training about 60 'experts' (both in the subject specialism and in the training process) per subject. We accept the principle (again based on GCSE experience) that it is essential to use people of high quality, and that it is an advantage to have fewer of them and to extend their programmes to include a large number of teachers' groups.

43. In phase 2, for each subject we envisage six days training per teacher, divided into two parts: first, as preparation for continuous assessment, two days for familiarisation with the

programmes of study and attainment targets and for internal assessment of these; and, secondly, at a later point, as preparation for tasks and reporting, four days focussed on the assessment itself prior to the unreported trials (described in paragraphs 190, 191 of our main report). Training for one subject teacher (head of department) per school is envisaged: thus 4,500 teachers will be involved per subject. Each subject 'expert' will train some 75 teachers: and at two days per teacher for the first part, some 9,000 days per subject will be required. Since we assume that two subjects - maths and science - will be introduced at the outset, and it is possible that an introduction pattern of two subjects per year will follow, some 18,000 days per year could be required. The second part of phase 2 training, and phase 3, would follow at the appropriate intervals.

44. If these requirements are fitted to the likely phasing schedule, the following would seem to offer the most probable scenario:

Year 1 Preparation for continuous assessment

At start of school year 1989-90, subject targets and programmes of study for maths and science introduced for the third key stage (12-14). Familiarisation with programmes of study and attainment targets - two days per subject at one teacher per school (18,000 days in all).

Year 2

1990-91, trialling of assessment tasks in some schools.

Year 3 Preparation for tasks and reporting

1991-92, 4 days INSET per subject (36,000 days in all) to precede "dummy run" of assessment tasks in summer 1992, not reported.

Year 4

1992-93, first operational use of age 14 assessment, with reporting.

The same pattern should be envisaged for each subject subsequently introduced.

45. GCSE training offers some pointers to good practice:

- the important role of LEAs should be recognised and the close cooperation of the advisory service encouraged, as should that of the senior management of schools and of teacher training institutions;

- adequate secondment time should be allowed for the subject 'experts' (phase 2 trainers);

- evaluative reports should be made available to trainers in phase 2;

- phase 2 training should give attention to the future training role of the participants;

- general principles are best explored through teaching and assessment materials;

- the combining of different schools (subject departments) in phase 3 training is advantageous, especially if trainers can also be present;

- consideration needs to be given to ways of avoiding staleness on the part of the trainers.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

46. As explained earlier, the only resource requirement to which we have given detailed attention is that for in-service

training, simply because it will be by far the largest. We believe however that the prime need is not simply for the injection of extra funds in the expectation that this will automatically ensure that substantial new demands for INSET will be met. The capacity to use such support depends in the first place on the availability of teachers for replacement or cover, and on the capacity of schools to continue to give pupils adequate attention whilst regular staff are absent. In both these respects the school system is already fully extended. So any new demand can only be met in the school system by a shift in priorities so as to re-deploy the resources already being made available for INSET and related activities. It follows that no net extra cost arises from the in-service programme we envisage.

47. There remains however the problem of whether the total needs for the new system would require such a large proportion of current INSET provision that it would cause major disruption to other INSET programmes. Given the outstanding importance of the implementation of the national curriculum, a substantial re-deployment would, we believe, be justified. To consider the practical scope for this, we have carried out a case study in one large county LEA to compare the needs outlined in this report with their current total provision. Informal consultation with another county LEA and with a London borough have confirmed that the example is not atypical. The details are given in Appendix A. The result can be summarised briefly: provision on the scale envisaged above would use about 10% to 12% of the LEA's current provision for National Priority Areas under the LEATGS, or about 5% to 6% of the authority's total LEATGS provision. Thus, even if we have underestimated the requirements and they prove to be, say, double the amounts we have identified, there would still not seem to be a serious problem in redeploying existing resources to meet them.

48. It is important to recognise that this in-service training effort reflects the initial implementation requirements of both the national curriculum and its assessment. Once it is in full operation throughout the system, the in-service effort involved

will be very much less. There will of course be a number of other costs entailed in conducting, recording and reporting the assessments in schools - for example, the provision of supply cover where appropriate, and non-teaching costs - in addition to those incurred centrally and regionally in developing and supplying assessment instruments and operating the moderation system. These we cannot quantify at this stage: they will depend very much on the nature and range of assessment instruments to be adopted subject by subject.

CONCLUSION

49. The major requirements of the system of support lie in the in-service training of teachers to prepare them for the national curriculum and assessment, and in the materials needed to underpin this process. Redeployment of existing resources can make a major contribution to the support system. Our proposals for the structure and organisation of the system at local, regional and national level build on good practice which already exists in collaboration between national agencies, GCSE Groups, LEAs and individual schools. We believe that our recommendations offer a firm foundation for an effective, responsive and professional assessment system in which the public can have full confidence.

REDEPLOYMENT OF RESOURCES
A CASE STUDY IN A LARGE COUNTY LEA

1. This case study seeks to give a broad picture of the scale of INSET provision in one LEA, and to identify the scope for using or adapting this provision to take account of requirements generated by new arrangements for assessment and testing. For the purposes of the exercise a "broad brush" approach is sufficient and figures used have been rounded.

Existing training effort

2. The Authority has about 12,000 teachers in approximately 750 schools. The in-service budget in the 1987-88 financial year stands at about £4.8m for the schools sector (compared with a DES LEATGS allowance of about £3.9m). Of the £4.8m, about £1.4m represents the sector's share of on-costs (premises, materials, equipment, inspectors/advisers, advisory teachers); the balance was planned to cover around 76,000 training days, most of which would involve absence from the classroom and for which supply cover would be available. The Authority's decision to plan on the latter basis took into account the below-average PTRs and the likelihood that without such cover many schools would be unable to respond to INSET opportunities.

3. The 76,000 days quoted above represent something over 3% of the total available teaching capacity within the 190 days on which schools are open. In addition, the so-called "Baker" days generate a potential 60,000 days, some of which will be used for INSET. These do not involve supply cover and are therefore largely (apart from the cost of overheads, materials and in some cases visiting lecturers) cost-free. They are essential for any INSET activities involving most or all the teachers in any particular school; and, conversely, when such days are designated, it is necessary for the school to ensure that

appropriate INSET activity is available for all members of staff on the day in question.

National and local priorities

4. The initially-planned provision of 76,000 days looks as if it will in practice turn out to be nearer 80,000, split as follows:

National Priority Area	(NPA)	40,000 days
Locally Assessed Needs	(LAN)	40,000 days

The balance between NPA and LAN as reflected in DES grant-related expenditure figures is in the ratio of 2 to 3 (32,000 days NPA and 48,000 LAN). The reality is that as a result of local decisions, NPAs are supported to a proportionately greater extent than that, not only within Training Grant Scheme funding but also from within the LEA's own additional funding. This is particularly the case in respect of the priority areas covering management, mathematics, special needs and industry. HE institutions are involved as providers of about one-third of NPA days. Most of the LAN days are devoted to short courses, workshops, working groups, etc. HE institutions are responsible for about half the LAN provision; the rest is delivered through the County Programmes and local teachers' centres. Most of the activities supported relate to specific curriculum areas or general curricular and other professional aspects of schools' work.

Scope for redeployment

5. With both NPA and LAN provision it would be possible to give some attention to a new assessment system in programmes relating to management and the main subject areas (although some of this provision has other specific objectives which should not be lost sight of, eg retraining; and other requirements stemming from the Education Reform Bill such as training in local financial management and any other aspects of the national

curriculum not covered under assessment would also have to be accommodated). Management courses for new or existing Heads and other senior staff could include inputs which would assist in spreading awareness of the new system and its requirements. Similarly any programmes aimed at subject-orientated Heads of Department could be used in a structured, planned way.

6. There is clearly scope for using the programme relating to the assessment of achievement, although this would need careful adjustment, given that the Authority is one of those involved in the Records of Achievement Project and is deliberately using much of the money to sustain dissemination of the work. There would be little if any scope for using the remaining priority programmes (drugs, multi-ethnic, RE) as a vehicle. A number of LAN activities would on the other hand provide further limited opportunities for focussing on a new system of assessment; but it has to be recognised that the coverage of teachers would be more limited and generally more random than would be the case with a planned overall programme. Given the size of the HE contribution (nearly one-third of NPA and about half of LAN), it would be important to ensure that HE providers were conversant with the changes that would need to be introduced in their programmes.

The Case Study Scheme

7. If all teachers are going to be made aware of the new system and its requirements through INSET programmes, then specific arrangements will need to be set up with each LEA to achieve this. Existing programmes will not of themselves provide this coverage - they could and should continue, however, to supplement and reinforce any specific programme designed for overall awareness. A possible strategy which combines the use of LEATGS programmes and "Baker" days is being developed within the Authority. It draws to some extent on GCSE experience and inevitably relies broadly on a cascade approach (but with some modification of the GCSE pattern). It is similar, though not identical in all detailed respects, to the scheme described in the main part of the Task Group's third supplementary report,

having been geared to the case study Authority's particular circumstances.

(a) Awareness programme for headteachers

8. The task would be tackled in two ways. First of all, it is essential that Heads understand what is happening and are committed to ensuring that appropriate training takes place for their staff; in primary schools especially they will need to be directly involved in it. At least one day, and possibly a second day, should be devoted to this task - some and possibly most of it can be arranged within the framework of local meetings with Heads and need not call significantly upon LEATGS resources. Two days might be regarded as slightly generous - but, if it secures a better understanding and greater commitment, then it is good investment.

(b) Awareness training for class teachers

9. Secondly, each school would be expected to appoint an "assessment leader" for whom "awareness" training will be provided. Thereafter, the Heads and assessment leaders would between them be responsible for delivering school-based training within one (or more) "Baker" days.

10. The whole strategy would be supported throughout by two selected teams of "trainers" (one team for primary and the other for secondary). The case study Authority has already programmed a 3-day preparatory workshop for a secondary team to be working within the current assessment and training programme; parallel development on the primary front is planned for later this year. This round of awareness training would be completed by the summer of 1989. The whole process would require at least 3,000 training days (from the LEATGS allocation) and at least 12,000 Baker days plus some non-funded headteacher time and involvement. The "awareness" exercise would also be complemented by inputs into the existing arrangements for management and subject training.

11. The difficult question is to identify how much time will be required for specific training in assessment and, particularly for primary teachers, in the processes and practice of moderation. The scale and phasing of INSET provision will also depend upon decisions about the phasing of the introduction of the new system. Whilst some of this INSET could perhaps be undertaken with 'Baker' days, it is on balance more likely to have to be spread throughout the year and for the funding to include the cost of supply cover.

Timing and other constraints

12. Because LEATGS funding operates on a financial year basis and most INSET planning takes place in relation to the academic year, there is usually a commitment into the succeeding financial year in respect of summer term provision during any academic year. In practice, in the case study Authority the 1988-89 financial year programme is virtually already settled and there will be a commitment running through into the summer term of 1989, to which however some adjustment might be possible. Some on-costs also carry forward and are a restraint on the scope for redeployment, at least in the short term.

Illustrative figures: the TGAT model

13. Assuming that national curriculum and assessment arrangements begin to be introduced from 1989, then the case study Authority's main need for training days might be broadly as follows using for this purpose the model in the Task Group's third supplementary report:

Training days per school year

	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3/4
Primary	600	3,600	3,600	3,600
Secondary	150	600	-	1,200
Total training days	750	4,200	3,600	4,800

61

Notes

(1) Year 0 is assumed to be school year 1988-89, in which the awareness programme for headteachers takes place. Cascade training for class teachers begins in year 1, ie school year 1989-90.

(2) Of the 600 primary schools, about half are combined infant and junior (ie contain 7 and 11 year olds), about a quarter infant-only (7 year olds), and about a quarter junior-only (11 year olds). All 600 would be involved in the first cascade phase (preparation for continuous assessment) in year 1, each sending 2 teachers for 3 days each. Some 450 schools with 7 year olds would be involved in the second cascade phase (preparation for tasks and moderating) in year 2, each sending 2 teachers for 4 days. About the same number with 11 year olds would be involved in the second cascade phase in year 4. If only 2 of the 3 national curriculum core subjects were introduced in primary schools in year 1, with the third following in year 2, there might be an additional need for second cascade phase training covering the third subject in year 3 (for 7 year olds) and years 4/5 (11 year olds), and conceivably for some more first cascade phase training in the immediately preceding years. So the year 3/4 figure in the table is more tentative.

(3) For the 150 secondary (and special) schools, the first cascade phase in year 1 would require 1 teacher per subject per school for 2 days each. The second cascade phase in year 3 would involve 1 teacher per subject per school for 4 days each. The figures in the table assume the introduction of 2 national curriculum core subjects in secondary schools in year 1, but make no assumption about the timing of other core or foundation subjects. They would obviously need to be increased pro rata for the introduction of other subjects from year 1 or succeeding

years, so the later year figures in the table are more tentative.

(4) Not all of the training days will entail the same costs: for example, some - like the headteacher awareness programme - may not necessarily call for supply cover. Some parts of the cascade process - especially the later stages, not shown above, extending to all subject/class teachers - could be undertaken in "Baker" days.

(5) When translated into corresponding financial year programmes, the figures will build up more gradually.

Conclusion

14. It is clear from this case study that the basic requirement for the early years of introduction of the national curriculum and assessment in the case study LEA is of the order of 4,000-5,000 training days per annum. That represents about 10-12% of this Authority's training day provision for NPA purposes under the LEATGS, or 5-6% of total LEATGS capacity - and the percentage could be lower if the availability of some "Baker" days is taken into account. Even if the coverage and pace of introduction were expedited, the requirements would still amount to only a small proportion of the current training effort. Bearing in mind that training in assessment of the kind envisaged would also contribute to meeting the new curricular objectives, it is plain that existing training programmes could be adjusted to accommodate the needs specified in the Task Group's report.